

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

OGC Has Reviewed

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

11th Meeting

Thursday, 22 October 1953

4:00 p.m.

DCI's Conference Room

Administration Building

1

DOCUMENT NO. _____
NO CHANGE IN CLASS
 DECLASSIFIED
CLASS, CHANGED TO: S 02011
NEXT REVIEW DATE:
AUTH: HR 70-2
DATE 19 JUN 1981 REVIEWER: 02912

Security Information

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

OGC Has Reviewed

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

11th Meeting

Thursday, 22 October 1953

4:00 p.m.

DCI's Conference Room

Administration Building

In Attendance:

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Chairman

Matthew Baird



25X1A9A

Lawrence R. Houston



25X1A9A

Huntington Sheldon



25X1A9A

Lawrence K. White



Executive Secretary

Secretariat

Reporter

25X1A9A

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

I N D E X

	Page
1. Minutes	1
✓ 2. Legislative Task Force Report - General Especially definition of Career Service	1 - 4
✓ 3. Education Allowances	4 - 9
✓ 4. Retirement System Also hazardous duty and insurance	9 - 17
5. Schedule for Future Meetings.	17
6. National Security Medal CIA Medals and Medal of Freedom delegation	17 - 20

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

. . . The 11th Meeting of the CIA Career Service Board convened at 4:00 p.m., 22 October 1953, in the DCI's Conference Room, Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick presiding . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, gentlemen, we are going to keep to our one hour schedule so will you come to order, please?

Are there any comments, corrections, etc., to the minutes of the last meeting?

MR. WHITE: I don't know whether this is a comment or a correction but regarding paragraph 6 it was not my understanding that we were to discuss this promotion policy at this meeting. In any case, I have not seen the Staff Study presented last time, nor have I had time to do anything about it since then. So I am not prepared to discuss it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You would be glad to have that changed to read it will be brought up at a future meeting? It is so done.

I think prior to moving on to the specific subjects we are going to discuss today we might take a quick glance at the covering report of the Task Force, which is dated 9 October.

John, do you have any comments to make on that? I think it is the most pertinent thing. Actually it is paragraph 3 on page 2 which gets into the philosophy of career service. As you indicate there, you apparently had a slight difference of view.

25X1A9A

(2) I think so, Kirk. I think that is very important. And also, which is not completely apparent from the way this is worded here, what we had in mind, we don't recommend legislation at this time but we do ask for specific approval from this Board and from the DCI of these points, in principle, so we can move forward in planning and approval on these things. We want to make that abundantly clear. To read this quickly you might get the impression the Task Force doesn't recommend any legislation so there's nothing to study. Each of the offices that have some concern here can be moving forward if we have an agreement in principle. I want to make that point clear. Other than that I think the report fairly speaks for itself.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In other words, what you are saying is that you recommend that the Board consider the recommendations of the Legislative Task Force and pass on presenting them to the Director as recommendations to be dealt with when it is practical to do so?

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] : Right.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Which I think is a fairly reasonable suggestion because I think we all recognize that there is going to be a time for presenting any such legislation to the Congress. It may not be the next session.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] That is right. You have already made the point in paragraph 3 that there may be a lot of debate, which I think this Board has to come to grips with sooner or later, and probably the sooner the better, because some of the concepts in this are inherent in what the Career Boards are doing today, plus how we approach some of our legislative recommendations.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: My personal reaction is that the first statement made on page 2 is the correct description of the career service.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] That is that statement in paragraph 3, Kirk?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] : May I have that again?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It's page 2 of the covering memo. In paragraph 3 there are two indented paragraphs, both of which are, in general terms, a description of the career service, and it is my view that the first of those two better describes the career service as I see it.

MR. BAIRD: You think it must be one or the other and not one and some of the other? Is there anything objectionable, for instance, in the second one?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Nothing objectionable but it just doesn't go far enough.

MR. BAIRD: I was wondering whether it must be "and/or" or whether you think one covers everything you want to say. That paragraph doesn't specifically say anything about eliminating from the service, in an equitable manner, those who fail to perform as effective members of the Agency.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] I don't think that ought to be in there. When you are speaking of a career service all of your statements should be on the constructive side. There should be no negative elements at all.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] On that point, General Smith specifically asked that it be in.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] The first is a statement of career service and the other one is a statement of the program.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] That is the fine difference.

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is there any violent objection to the first paragraph as a statement of career service?

MR. SHELDON: Isn't it subject to a good deal of interpretation? What do we mean by "extensively trained"? If you are going to pull this thing apart in detail you have a lot of words to consider. In other words, can somebody not become part of the career service unless he has been extensively trained? And if so what is "extensively trained"?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would say that certainly some of the words in it could be subject to question, but the general concept is what we mean.

MR. SHELDON: The question in my mind, which I think reflects a good deal of the feeling on the DD/I side, is that if you devise that particular definition then a force may stem from that definition to certain other acceptabilities of obligations which, while not spelled out, are inherent in this particular paragraph.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Would you care to be more specific?

MR. SHELDON: I can't at this time but I think you understand what I mean.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But it seems to me that inherent in here is a slight divergence of view between the DD/I side and the DD/P side based upon the perhaps unjustified fear on the DD/I side that acceptance of that statement would automatically require, perforce, that everybody accept overseas assignments. Isn't that really what we are skirting around?

MR. SHELDON: I wouldn't say that, no, because a lot of DD/I people would love to have foreign assignments and can't have them. I don't think the question of overseas assignments is the issue at all.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think it boils down fairly simply to a feeling that in a service like this--and admittedly we are one that encompasses everything which is unusual--that there should be a requirement to do what the service requests in order to obtain in return the benefits of a career service.

MR. SHELDON: I don't think anybody objects to that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If that is acceptable I don't see any point of contention.

MR. SHELDON: It's a question of language.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would recommend, then, that we not worry about the language immediately.

MR. SHELDON: If you buy this you buy language. Perhaps it would be

Security Information

possible to attempt to redraft this in terms which would be acceptable to all concerned.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that probably would be a fairly beneficial operation because apparently the Legislative Task Force did find itself split.

MR. SHELDON: You probably had the same problem in the Task Force. 25X1A9A

[REDACTED] Yes, the Task Force had both Kirk's problem and your problem.

MR. SHELDON: And this is so far the best language compromise?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Apparently it isn't the best language.

MR. SHELDON: Maybe a compromise in the language could be worked out that would really be satisfactory to both, some incorporation, without in any sense taking the steam out of the service aspect, which is inherent in any career program.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, rather than hang on this suppose we pass this point and I'll ask [REDACTED] to draft an across-the-board, acceptable version of this, and get your concurrence as well as that of the rest of the Board.

[REDACTED] Are you making me expendable, Kirk? (Laughter)

25X1A9A

Could I have some help on this, Kirk? Could I co-op somebody?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Mr. Sheldon certainly would be willing to expend an individual for cooperation with you on it. 25X1A9A

[REDACTED]: I think that since we have the tab on obligations to discuss two weeks from today, that that discussion might help us in the actual language. After that discussion has taken place we can perhaps come up with a language that is acceptable to everybody. But I don't mean that we will delay working on this for two weeks.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: My only suggestion is that we get a statement that is acceptable across-the-board, because it would provide a better point of departure for any point of discussion. I have the Task Force paper on my desk now, which I have chewed up a bit. But that will be the next major item before the Board, and unless we have this established before you get that why it's putting the cart before the horse.

Shall we go to Tab C, Allowances to Agency Officers and Employees for Education of Minor Dependents. Now it has been brought to my attention that in certain instances this has been done under existing Regulations, is that correct?

MR. WHITE: That is correct. As a matter of fact, the Agency policy at the moment is that while we have no general legal authority to pay for schooling

of minor dependent children it may be done under two circumstances. One is where it is necessary for the man to live his cover, to over-simplify it, and the other is where you can put it on the basis that if the Director did not authorize such payment it would be impossible to operate in an area because he couldn't get anybody to go there. Now that, very simply, is the basis on which we have approved some

25X1A



(5) MR. KIRKPATRICK: That, however, I don't think should in any way lessen the impact of this.

MR. WHITE: No, it's just an emergency measure, really, to take care of some rather difficult situations.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is there any disagreement with either the discussion or the recommendations?

MR. SHELDON: I have one point to raise which arises from George Carey's comments with me. I attempted to get all of the views of the various AD's and the DD/I before appearing here, and he raises the point that can consideration be given for equivalent benefits for "foreign National employees"? In other words, he recognizes that in any one of his tightly knit little organizations there can be salary differentials and benefits that are very likely to cause friction between the Nationals which he employs and our own U. S. employees. Has that not been considered in any of it?

25X1A [REDACTED] It was considered at all as far as I can see, off-hand, in this paper. It wasn't limited to citizens, though.

MR. SHELDON: Would that have any legal barriers to that aspect of broadening the grant?

MR. HOUSTON: No. You might have a little more trouble if you tried to justify that alone, but as to leaving the legislation available for that purpose I don't think there is any problem. This is designed to do it for career employees, who normally would be citizens, but if we make it all-inclusive we could handle that by internal action.

MR. SHELDON: That is my only comment.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I wonder how wide that would open the door, because wouldn't we then be getting into the position where the Congress would inquire whether that would establish a precedent where civilian employees of the Army, for example, overseas, could make a similar claim?

MR. WHITE: State Department has a large number of indigenous personnel.

██████████ They are prohibited by law from paying it for American 25X1A9A
Nationals so naturally they don't for foreigners.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: John, did the Task Force get into any of the reasons why State does not have this? 25X1A9A

██████████ Generally because they haven't been able to get it. They tried twice, specifically, that I know of and haven't been able to make the grade yet.

██████████ There is a Bureau of the Budget Task Force working on it. 25X1A9A
Defense is the only Agency that has it.

██████████ They have it by providing a facility, not money. They provide a school and teachers.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Do U. S. citizens who are employees of the Department of the Army, for example, are their children allowed to go to these Army schools overseas or do they have to pay the same way ours do? U. S. citizens, civilian employees of the Army, for example in Tokyo?

MR. WHITE: They go free, yes. I would suggest that Larry's problem is 25X1A
a little different. You take █████ for instance, █████ those are for the 25X1A
most part not locally hired people. They are people that have been hired in a lot 25X1A
of different places, █████ Most of them are not native indigenous people, and so you do have the same problem there, really, of giving somebody who has dependent children some incentive to come. Now on 25X1A
██████████

██████████ They are people who have come from their own 25X1A

[countries. I think he has a real problem there which is a little different.]

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Isn't the obvious answer, then, to try in the legislation to get permission for CIA to do it for its employees?

MR. HOUSTON: And control it administratively.

[Would this include college education?]

25X1A9A

[No, with a highschool cut-off. That is the basis on which the Bureau of the Budget Task Force is working.]

MR. WHITE: I think it would be very unwise to make any proposal for anything more than highschool to Congress.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You are right.

25X1A9A

[The Task Force certainly thought so and was unanimous on that.]

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any further discussion of this?

25X1A9A

(3) [On page 5 of the covering memorandum, paragraph c, it is not quite in line with the recommendations in Tab C. It says that the Office of the General Counsel should be requested to follow legislative proposals being studied in the Bureau of the Budget and report to the Career Service Board any developments which would indicate desirability of a different approach on this problem. This was not included in the recommendation in Tab C, and I prefer the one I have just read. In Tab C they recommend that the Office of General Counsel be requested to draft appropriate legislation and that the DD/A be requested to assume over-all responsibility for action. Do we want to follow the Bureau of the Budget effort in this regard and see whether the approach in Tab C is what we want?]

MR. HOUSTON: What we want to do is draft the legislation and hold it, and see if the Bureau of the Budget legislation is okay.

25X1A9A

[The Bureau of the Budget's preliminary draft applies to]

American citizens.

25X1A9A

[It would cover us now.]

[It specifically says "citizens" and, consequently, if we want to broaden this to include employees without any restriction as to citizenship, we would have a problem.]

25X1A9A

[I don't think they are inconsistent. I think they might be overlapping. The point is well taken. In a sense we approve both the Tab and the recommendation in the over-all report.]

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any dissension from that view?

MR. WHITE: I might interject here that there is a Task Force which is being spearheaded by the State Department--the Kaplan Committee--primarily to try to draft a personnel management program for all overseas personnel, for FOA, State, etc. They had us thrown into the hopper, too, but we requested that we be thrown out of the hopper as far as their correspondence with the Civil Service Commission is concerned. But we have arranged for our Personnel people to sit in on all of the deliberations that Committee goes through so we will be able to know all the time exactly what their thinking is and be able to make some recommendations as to whether we should or should not get in on a specific thing. And I think this principle would be served through that mechanism.

③
MR. HOUSTON: There is one practical question: whenever you go for legislation you are required to accompany your suggestion with an estimate of the increased cost because of the legislation. Should we be working on some sort of an estimate?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would recommend you hold that until we have the legislative package put together because it might result in an economy of effort. Actually, I think at the time we present these to the Director he may raise the same question.

MR. HOUSTON: We may be required to do that even if we ride on the Bureau of the Budget.

[REDACTED] At present does that look like a budgetary item of any magnitude? 25X1A9A

[REDACTED]: No.

MR. WHITE: I wouldn't think so. I would say less than half a million, as an off-hand guess.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that would be high. 25X1A9A

[REDACTED] I'm setting it at that magnitude but I think it is a little high, yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then I assume it is the will of the Board that this Tab be approved for presentation to the Director at the appropriate time, and it is my assumption that you would want to have all of this presented to the Director in one package. I think he would prefer it that way.

MR. SHELDON: That is, with the consideration of including on an employee basis or Nationals.

~~SECRET~~

Security Information

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] It should accept the indigenous employees, however.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is an administrative decision after we get the right.

[REDACTED] We ought not miss that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Tab D is "Liberalized Retirement System for CIA Employees."

John, do you have some comment on a voluntary retirement fund?

[REDACTED]: Colonel White?

25X1A9A

(A) MR. WHITE: I have two papers here, and because one of them comes from the Director of Security I think it would be best if I just read it, because it is a dissent from this paper and perhaps should be incorporated into the record.

. . . The above-mentioned paper from the Director of Security was then read into the record by Mr. White and is appended hereto as Tab A . . .

~~SECRET~~

MR. WHITE: I'm not going to read this other paper, but the Personnel Office has explored this--I think not too deeply--and has written a paper here in which they try to make some comparison between what Foreign Service people get, how much FBI gets, and how much you would have to put in in order to bring such a system about. I think I can sum it up, Rud, by saying that you conclude we would certainly have to do much more extensive research to find out whether or not it is feasible from a security standpoint.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] This is addressed to the IG and concerns allowing people to make voluntary contributions.

MR. BAIRD: Matched by the Agency?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You couldn't match it by the Agency without legislation.

MR. BAIRD: I wondered whether that was in the paper.

MR. WHITE: Not in the Personnel Office paper. But who contributes it?

M [REDACTED] The individual.

25X1A9A

MR. WHITE: But I think their proposal is that the DCI would contribute it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Your contribution would be much more profitable if you contribute to an insurance policy than if you contribute to a retirement fund. 25X1A9A

[REDACTED] That is the whole approach we have taken, and the Security Advisor to the Insurance Task Force is prepared to brief the actuaries who will be on duty within three weeks to explore this problem of hazardous duty. That is why we have the Insurance Task Force. This Board agreed we would attempt to solve the hazardous duty problem through insurance rather than through hazardous duty pay or retirement.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I'd like to address myself to Colonel Edwards' paper first. I think he has a point there that by the phraseology of making this exclusively apply, in certain terms, to overseas that perhaps hazardous or hardship activities within the territorial or domestic limits of the United States have been excluded. From a practical political expediency I can't think of anything more fatal than putting that in legislation affecting the CIA, because the whole tenor of the Congress is that we operate outside the limits of the United States, and if we put in our Bill something about hardship posts within the United States, why I would hesitate to want to be around at such time.

MR. HOUSTON: Possibly you could state the authority broadly enough without raising the question, because--and, John, you can check me on this--but these

~~SECRET~~

Security Information

people working in the United States, unless they can certify that they expect to be sent overseas, are not even entitled to take up WAEPA Insurance, for example.

[REDACTED] Not now. It has been broadened.

25X1A9A

MR. HOUSTON: On the other hand, they have one benefit people abroad are not entitled to that comes up in flying on the regular flights. In this country there might be some entitlement, in certain circumstances, to a claim which might not arise overseas.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] The Insurance Task Force is going to take up that whole problem of non-scheduled flights and handle it from an insurance point of view.

MR. WHITE: It seems that Shef's paper hinges around whether you want to consider a liberalized retirement system and hazardous duty in the same package or whether you are going to treat them differently. What he is talking about, really, is hazardous duty. If we are going to treat them separately I think that is the answer to the problem. I am certainly sympathetic to the problem. I think it is perfectly ridiculous that they are asked to take the risk they do under conditions which wipe out \$40 thousand dollars worth of insurance to their families if they get knocked off. I think it's a serious problem.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] But I do think, as you do, Red, the question of hazardous duty should be regarded in and of itself, but I don't think we should confuse it with retirement, which is a quite different thing. Granted that in weighing your retirement benefits there may be certain things that should be put in the hopper on one side or the other, but the issue itself, that the retirement ought to be liberalized, shouldn't be tied down to where a guy serves or anything else, I think, because if we hang it on hazardous duty it is only going to apply, really, to a small segment of the Organization.

MR. BAIRD: That is the reason I did not dissent from this. My understanding was that career-wise the hazardous duty aspects of the state-side assignments would be covered by some other facet of career benefit than career retirement.

[REDACTED] That is the way we are proceeding at the moment.

25X1A9A

MR. BAIRD: If that should not take place then I would dissent from this paper on this basis.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we all recognize the practical aspect of the timing of when it should be put up.

MR. WHITE: Then if the Board feels that this paper is alright, before

~~SECRET~~

Security Information

{ final approval of the Director is asked, isn't it reasonable to say let's look at this and our hazardous duty proposal at the same time?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that is perfectly acceptable. I think the question now is whether to accept this as the liberalized retirement paper, with the assumption that hazardous duty, wherever performed, will be considered later.

MR. BAIRD: You don't feel that it is the nature of the assignment overseas? I just wondered. I might phrase it a little differently by saying we lose a number of clerical employees because they say they have been recruited to go overseas. I wonder whether their retirement benefit based on the type of assignment they have overseas, is the same or should be the same as a man or a girl whose duties are quite different. That brings you back to the description of the duties rather than blanket overseas duty.

25X1A9A

(4) [REDACTED] The blanket overseas retirement benefit in the Foreign Service is based on duty overseas, and it doesn't matter whether a man is living at an unhealthful post or living in London.

MR. BAIRD: I am assuming the Task Force took that into consideration. 25X1A9A

[REDACTED] You can make all the cases you want for a guy serving in 25X1A6A [REDACTED] having it a lot more uncomfortable but how do you work this out in degree or formulas. You just plain can't.

[REDACTED] : We gave up on that and used some yardstick actually far 25X1A9A less liberal than the Foreign Service approach. Again, we say ours is good and we take a less liberal approach than they do.

[REDACTED] Isn't it about half way between Civil Service and the 25X1A9A Foreign Service? 25X1A9A

[REDACTED] If a man serves half his time abroad it would work out that way. We took a combination of a man in career service where one man might be in 25X1A6A [REDACTED] and he might be in [REDACTED] but over his career it will equalize, the good with 25X1A6A the bad.

MR. SHELDON: Why did you elect to vary from the Foreign Service program?
What is the matter with the Foreign Service program?

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] It was too liberal.

MR. SHELDON: If they got it why wouldn't it be feasible for us to get it?

[REDACTED] That was our approach. 25X1A9A

[REDACTED] The history of the past several years has indicated that

if either the FBI or the Foreign Service tried to get what they now have, they would get turned down flat without even a full hearing; in other words, they are lucky to have what they have. This has been going on for a long time and the opinion is that no one could possibly get what the FBI and the Foreign Service have now. That is my interpretation.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]: There is one other important thing in here, too, that had a bearing on this thing, and that is the question that Foreign Service people who get this liberalized retirement don't get post differentials while abroad, and we don't want to get that same benefit. We felt it was more desirable to keep this post differential.

MR. HOUSTON: It's the old problem, you can't equalize in all respects what you think you can justify.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] I wondered if it makes much sense to lean heavily on the atmosphere in Congress these days. It's like the young Lieutenant was told: "The Colonel is in a bad mood this morning so don't talk to him on an important matter." It seems to me we all ought to address ourselves to what we think is right.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] Obviously we are all influenced by our opinions of what might happen, but we tried conscientiously to do what is desirable here rather than thinking of what we might get hit over the head on.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] I think the best answer you made, John, was that the differential does provide some part of this--that the post differential does provide some part of the monetary recompense.

MR. SHELDON: I think that is the pertinent facet.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Dick, to carry further what you said, I think our assumption must be that we are going to present this to the Congress at the earliest opportunity, and we can examine that system very practically when the moment arises by seeing whether the influential Senators and Members of the House give us an indication we will get it through, because we need this and if we want to establish a career service I have every indication that our people feel they must have a reasonable assurance from this Board that we are making an effort to get them the benefits to that career.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] And what is much worse is to go back to Congress to get it liberalized once it has been firmed up. That is the tough one.

MR. SHELDON: May I address myself to what I consider the nub of this

Security Information

whole problem? As I see it, it is this: We have talked about trying to find a definition of career service which would fit anybody in the Agency regardless of where they are allocated. To buy any of those definitions which are sound is going to require a certain obligation. That is inherent. When any individual buys an obligation he expects, in some instances, at least, in some measure a quid pro quo. Now as I have read through all of these tabs and looked at the problem--I trust, objectively--the only place, largely speaking, where a DD/I individual might expect to have some kind of balance and benefit would be with respect to retirement. As I read the proposals with respect to retirement they do not, since they deal largely with overseas service, meet what I think would be a fair plus on the part of a DD/I individual in terms of what is now proposed as the obligations which he would be asked to meet in signing up with the career service program. For my money, that is the nub of the problem.

(4) MR. KIRKPATRICK: What would you recommend as being required to satisfy DD/I employees?

MR. SHELDON: We were thinking in terms of the Foreign Service program. There is a provision in there, if I understand it correctly, where at the age of 50, under certain circumstances, after 20 years' service you can cash in your suit and get, I think it's two per cent per year, and you go on from there. Now that type of thing would, I think, be attractive and acceptable. Whereas under these circumstances here, since practically no overseas duty, on the average, is going to be available to DD/I people, you in effect stand pat on the Civil Service rights. That is the way I see this whole problem.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What are your views on this, John?

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] I can answer that in one way, for the moment, Kirk. He brought in the question of obligations so I assume he is referring to those in addition to the one about overseas service. It seemed to some of us that in connection with retirement that is true and if he accepts that obligation he should get a quid pro quo. Well, he gets that benefit when the obligation is taken up and he has been asked to go overseas, so when he has served then he gets the benefit, not just for taking the obligation but he gets it when he performs.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What you are saying there is that the fact that probably the majority of DD/I employees will never get requested to go overseas, that would in effect penalize them ultimately on their retirement.

~~SECRET~~

Security Information

MR. HOUSTON: If you are equating to Foreign Service, to qualify for Foreign Service they have to take overseas tours of duty.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We are very apt to get a rider put in this particular Bill that nobody will serve more than four years in the United States.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] You have this mandatory provision in the Foreign Service which I don't think we want to touch.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we have to look at this from the practical standpoint that if we go to Congress for all icing, and the cake, we are going to get a few nuts put into the cake, too. We are going to get restrictions on this as well as benefits.

MR. SHELDON: What I am trying to do is find some pattern throughout here-- and it may be possible to do--that has equal rights and the opposite of rights for an over-all intelligence service. Since the DD/P and the DD/I are quite different in their duties and functions, I'm not sure that it is going to be feasible, but I think it would be most undesirable to have one set up for certain people and another set up for others.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think you would get legislation on that basis. I think the Congress would insist that CIA employees be treated as a whole. 25X1A9A

[REDACTED] That, again, was our approach in here. While we recognized the practical distinctions between DD/I and DD/P, nevertheless this applied equally to all CIA employees, including the DD/A. They get the benefits for what they serve, although as a group there may be some differences.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: DD/A from that point of view is sort of the middle man in this.

MR. BAIRD: What you are worried about is that DD/I employees get very little more than say the Department of Agriculture employees, but that we do accept more obligations than the Department of Agriculture people.

MR. SHELDON: It's reconcilable to some point. I'm simply trying to see if we can come down to a pitch here where there is a little give and take on the paper so that it's palatable to everybody concerned.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Could you recommend some specific changes on this particular proposal?

MR. SHELDON: I haven't reached that point yet. I wish I had. 25X1A9A

[REDACTED] Is there a provision for temporary duty? What periods of

~~SECRET~~

foreign duty are contemplated?

[REDACTED] We haven't gone into those details yet.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]: Therefore, anybody on temporary duty a month or three months would get a certain amount of credit.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]: At the end of 20 years you total it up and it's cumulative.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It would affect some of DD/I's employees but a large percentage would not be affected.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]: It seems to me the difficulty in providing for equal benefits hinges around the justification for this early retirement. Presumably the justification is that you suffer by being uprooted and sent overseas and away from your American community and your children, and don't have quite the opportunities that you do have here; and therefore you have some wear and tear which justifies an earlier retirement. Presumably you have suffered to get this. If you don't suffer it by staying here, presumably you haven't had the wear and tear and are not entitled to it.

MR. SHELDON: Records indicate there is a terrific demand to serve overseas and I think the records will show it is not considered a liability.

25X1A9A MR. [REDACTED] If that is the case then the justification for early retirement won't stand up.

MR. SHELDON: Do we have any facts on that?

MR. BAIRD: I don't know whether it's the point. It seems to me we are trying to give benefits commensurate with the obligations. You wouldn't quarrel with the benefits that overseas people get. What you are concerned about is that the obligations that the DD/I people give up are or are assumed to be not compensated for by benefits.

MR. SHELDON: That is correct.

25X1A9A [REDACTED] There is something parallel in the military, at least in the Navy. They have an early retirement. An enlisted man can retire at the end of 20 years, and that is an inducement for them to come in because they know they can come in at a certain age and then they can retire and run a filling station at an early age. It's an inducement. However, this is an inducement and/or reward for taking a beating in being out of the country.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Isn't it a practical fact that the Foreign Service and the CIA both attract people to certain parts of their areas who are interested in

serving overseas, and just because they are interested in serving overseas and like to and want to, should that be a factor in not considering a liberalized retirement system for them?

[REDACTED]: There's another factor, too.

25X1A9A

. . . Off the record . . .

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] There is no such thing as perfect justice but we want to approach it with the idea of making it as perfect as we can.

(4) MR. KIRKPATRICK: Ting, would you be willing to accept this particular recommendation on its present basis, with the privilege of recalling it later for amendment after we get through the entire program?

MR. SHELDON: We have to get on with this business, that is the whole point, and while I'm not prepared today to try to offer some sort of mitigating compromise here, I am perfectly willing to buy it subject to its not being finally binding.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is that acceptable to everybody else?

MR. BAIRD: Yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any specific changes recommended in this paper? Is it the view of the Board to approve this paper as submitted, for presentation to the Director?

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] Hear, hear.

(5) MR. KIRKPATRICK: The last item on the agenda is the new business. Mr. [REDACTED] suggests that the two subjects to be taken up next week are Tabs A and B, because Medical Benefits and Death Gratuity seem to go together; then the following week Tabs F and G, Restrictions and Obligations, and Tenure, Job Security and Reduction in Force; then the week after that, Tab E, Personnel Reserve for CIA.

25X1A9A

You will send out a Notice to that effect?

[REDACTED] Yes.

25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any other new business?

I should report to you that both the Director and General Smith have approved the design of the National Security Medal, and it should be recorded that General Smith said he thought an excellent job had been done, and that it was a very good-looking Medal. The design for the Medal has now been taken to the

~~SECRET~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, which is required in the Executive Order.

Item 2 is the fact that, as directed by the Board, I raised with the Director and his Deputies last week the question of the DCI's authority to award the Medal of Freedom, and whether the Director approved of the system that the Board had gone over, of the National Security Medal as the top medal, and the Medal of Freedom as the second, and the silver and bronze medals as two internal CIA medals. The Director expressed his view as being in favor of that, and particularly being interested in the ability to award the Medal of Freedom because it was a Medal that could be awarded to foreigners, whereas the National Security Medal could not be awarded to them; and, consequently, it was a valuable Medal for the Director to have the authority to award. I also raised with him the question of whether he desired to obtain that authority by delegation from one of the Service Secretaries or whether he preferred the matter be raised once again with the Bureau of the Budget to get an Executive Order for him to award it directly. He expressed himself as favoring the latter method. Inquiry was made of General Smith as to why he had specifically asked not to have the Medal of Freedom awarded. We didn't get an answer to his reasons but we did get his concurrence in the Director's views that he should get that authority to award it. So I presume that is now in the mill to get the authority for the Director.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] Mr. Houston is working on it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And the Honor Awards Board can be advised the Director has approved of that system of the National Security Medal, the Medal of Freedom, and the two internal Medals.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] There is nothing in the Executive Order for the National Security Medal that prohibits its award to foreigners; in other words, it is permissive.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The view expressed in the Director's meeting was to the effect that here was the top intelligence Medal, and generally speaking we would not award it to foreigners but would save it for top level American performance.

MR. HOUSTON: Although General Smith specifically wanted it available to foreigners.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: General Cabell raised the point that he would like to see one Medal restricted exclusively for valorous service, and it was generally

~~SECRET~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

agreed that the internal silver medal would be more or less considered as the medal for valor in action, and the bronze medal for meritorious service.

MR. SHELDON: May I raise two questions, Kirk? The first one is that the last paper I read from the Honor Awards Board was to the effect that the Medal of Freedom was equivalent to a Bronze Star. Now can one change that simply by the Director's dictum?

25X1A9A MR. [REDACTED] Not the Medal of Freedom. You can't change the relationship of the Medal of Freedom to the Bronze Star.

MR. SHELDON: It's in the National ladder. The question is whether you want to put your internal medals on a different level or not, and it seems to me that is an unresolved point.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] The Honor Awards Board recommended that the sequence or hierarchy of medals be that the National Security Medal be the equivalent of the DSM; that the No. 1 CIA Medal, whether silver or what have you, be the equivalent of the Silver Star for gallantry or meritorious service--I don't remember exactly what it's for; and the No. 3 in the hierarchy being the second CIA Medal, presumably the bronze one, which would be the equivalent of the Bronze Star and the equivalent of the Medal of Freedom when that was awarded to foreigners. In other words, at the lowest level are three that are all the same, the CIA Medal, the Medal of Freedom and the Bronze Star, and those all rank together but they are awarded in different circumstances. I don't think we have much choice with respect to the Medal of Freedom.

⑥
MR. SHELDON: That is what I mean. In other words, if it was in the mind of the Director that he wanted to award the Medal of Freedom to an individual he would be giving him, in effect, in the National range, the Bronze Star rather than something which he thought might be ranked higher.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I gather he thought it would rank with something like the Legion of Merit. He can't decide the hierarchy.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] When the Medal of Freedom is awarded to Americans it is on a level with the Bronze Star.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Don't you think the Honor Awards Board should be more or less advised to stick to the hierarchy that has already been established, rather than trying to change it?

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] Very definitely. That is the way their Staff Study is

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

written.

MR. SHELDON: The other question I wanted to raise is that if you allocate any one Medal to valorous duty alone, the individual probably could never display it. You may be making a decision which is no decision.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't say they would definitely never enjoy displaying it but they might be prevented from doing so for a few years until the incident became historical, and in certain instances there might be a permanent enjoiner.

MR. SHELDON: And as it was written by the Honor Awards Board the Silver Award could be awarded either for valor in the field or for the equivalent of what one normally would be given for a Legion of Merit job in the Services. If you do it differently I think you are going to complicate the situation rather than otherwise, and make your awards problem more difficult than as already arranged by your Honor Awards Board.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED] Could we solve the problem perhaps this way, which is the way General Smith decided we should solve the National Security Medal, and that is when the National Security Medal is awarded for valor it will have what is technically called an "appurtenance", a little "v" or a palm on it, and when it is awarded for merit it would not. Now the CIA Medals could have the same thing.

MR. SHELDON: That doesn't get away from General Cabell's thesis that it should be an exclusive award for valor. I simply suggest that it might be reviewed in the light of practicalities.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think the next step is for the Honor Awards Board to come up with criteria for awarding these Medals.

Is there any further new business? If not, the meeting stands adjourned.

. . . The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m. . . .

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~